08-01789-cgm Doc 14043-14 Filed 09/14/16 Entered 09/14/16 22:16:53 Exhibit N Pg 1 of 4

EXHIBIT N

Page 18

the last several years of Madoff's operation.

THE COURT: All right. Let me rephrase what I said. During the period that they agree that the records accurately reflect the deposits and the withdrawals, does that agreement include any inter-account transfers during that period?

MS. CHAITMAN: I don't have every affidavit in my mind, but I do not believe that it does, because it's only the last two to four years, except Mr. Oasis went back to 2000.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. CHAITMAN: But I don't believe that there are inter-account transfers within this period, and I don't think the bank subpoenas would reveal any evidence of an inter-account transfer.

THE COURT: That, I agree. I agree. Look, what I said repeatedly was that if they would agree that they got the withdrawals -- I was focusing on withdrawals, but I guess made the deposits that are indicated, certainly for the periods covered by the subpoena, and I understand that the subpoenas are now reaching -- going farther back, that they don't have to produce bank records just on that issue if they admit that they've got the deposits and the withdrawals. I realize that there are affirmative defenses and things like that.

Page 19

MR. JACOBS: Right.

THE COURT: We'll address that in a minute. But it seems to me, for what the bank subpoenas were looking for, if they admit that the deposits and the withdrawals during the period they acknowledge are accurate, subject to possible exceptions for inter-account transfers, which I didn't expect them to be in a position to admit, then that satisfies that aspect of the bank subpoena.

MR. JACOBS: Well, Your Honor, from our perspective we don't -- legally our position is we don't need the bank records to prove any aspect of our case. The BLMIS records we have and that we produced to Ms. Chaitman in every single one of these cases together, as verified by the JP Morgan account records for BLMIS accounts, which show the account balance activity --

THE COURT: You're sure going through a lot of effort to get the records if you don't need them.

MR. JACOBS: Well, Your Honor, Ms. Chaitman is contesting the accuracy of our records. And Your Honor has not yet ruled on whether our proofs are sufficient. So we would be committing malpractice if we didn't aggressively pursue, given Ms. Chaitman's challenge to our records, the bank records from the defendant, which I might add, the defendant's had an obligation to preserve at a minimum, when they filed their claims back in 2009 and most of them did.

Page 20

So I'm not saying we're going to get life of the account bank subpoena bank records for each defendant in every single case. Most of the banks are telling us they only have some limited subset of those documents for the life of the account. But I'm entitled to at least try. Because if I can't get them, I also have a potential spoliation argument that, in a worst-case scenario, I'm entitled to make, because that may entitle me to an adverse inference as to the defendant's challenge to my proofs.

THE COURT: I think we're talking about two different things.

MR. JACOBS: Okay.

embodied in an order in each case, a brief order, which you can send on notice, or submit a consent order, that the client -- I'm sorry, the defendant acknowledges that the deposits listed in whatever column it was, and the withdrawals listed in whatever column it is, for the years that they're willing to admit, were actually made, in the case of deposits, or withdrawals were made and received for the years -- you know, you're not going to get an agreement about inter-account transfers, and there's nothing in the bank records.

MR. JACOBS: I'm not asking for one, Your Honor, I only based --